

Application No. 09/605,289

Filing Date: June 28, 2000

Docket No. TER-008PUS

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the present application. Claims 29-44 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-11, 16-17, 19-21 and 45 stand rejected. Claims 12-15, 18, 22-28 and 46-48 are objected to. Claims 1 and 45 have been amended.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, stating that figure 14C was missing. The drawings have been amended such that original figures 14, 14A, and 14B are now labeled 14A, 14B and 14C. The specification is herein amended to reflect this change. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 16-17, 19-21 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,324,298 to O'Dell et al. (hereinafter O'Dell) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,371,690 to Engel et al. (hereinafter Engel).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the image model processor determines a presence of an object within a region of interest, that the structural model processor determines structural features of the object and that the geometric model processor determines a precise location of the object. Neither O'Dell nor Engel, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an image model processor which determines a presence of an object within a region of interest, a structural model processor which determines structural features of the object and a geometric model processor which determines a precise location of the object. O'Dell and Engel are believed to disclose only a single model which is used for inspection of a device. Accordingly, since O'Dell and Engel disclose a single model, amended claim 1 is believed allowable over Odell in view of Engel.

Claim 17 recites the steps of applying a first model and applying a second model. O'Dell and Engel are believed to disclose a single model, thus claim 17 is believed allowable over O'Dell in view of Engel.

Claim 45 has been amended to recite that the structural model processor determines structural features of the object and that the geometric model processor determines a precise location of the object. As stated above, Neither O'Dell nor Engel, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a structural model processor which determines structural features of the object and a geometric model processor which determines a precise location of the object. O'Dell and Engel are believed to disclose only a single model which is used for inspection of a device. Accordingly, since O'Dell and Engel disclose a single model, amended claim 45 is believed allowable over Odell in view of Engel.

Claims 2-16, 18-28 and 46-48 depend from claims 1, 17 or 45 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Claims 29-44 are herein canceled without prejudice.

The prior art made of record is not believed to disclose or suggest the present invention.

In view of the above, the Examiners rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing claims 1-28 and 45-48 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully invited to

Application No. 09/605,289
Filing Date: June 28, 2000
Docket No. TER-008PUS

telephone the undersigning attorney if there any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0845.

Respectfully submitted,
Daly, Crowley & Mofford, LLP

Dated: 14-July-03

By: David W. Rouille
David W. Rouille
Reg. No. 40,150
Attorney for Applicant(s)

275 Turnpike Street – Suite 101
Canton, MA 02021-2310
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 x25
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966